

The University of Chicago

THE SCHOLIA OF BARHEBRAEUS
ON THE BOOK OF ISAIAH

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE DIVINITY SCHOOL IN
CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR
OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE
AND INTERPRETATION
1933

By
JOHN HARDEN HICKS

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
1935

The University of Chicago

THE SCHOLIA OF BARHEBRAEUS
ON THE BOOK OF ISAIAH

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE DIVINITY SCHOOL IN
CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR
OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE
AND INTERPRETATION
1933

By
JOHN HARDEN HICKS

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
1935



His Sections, *begin* in the Anṣar Rāzē

The Book of Isaiah has seventeen folios in the Storehouse of Mysteries, except the first and last of these are not full pages. This material is broken up into parts, a proem and thirty sections (*begin*). These sections vary in length considerably, ranging from eight to eighty lines in the English translation, the longer ones having much more critical and exegetical material. The basis for this division into sections is nowhere made clear. These could hardly be thought divisions for there are no evident breaks of thought with which they agree. Seven^a of these sections start with verses which begin our chapters and seven^b more may do so, as the first verses of our chapters within these sections fall within the Biblical material between the used portions at the close of one division and that at the opening of another. But even here there is disclosed no thought basis for grouping chapters as we know them. On the contrary the Scripture with which one section opens is at one in thought with that which the preceding division closed. Section six closes its last Scripture quotation with the last word of 13:10 and section seven opens with the first word of 13:11, and the two verses are dealing with the same subject matter. Verses 33:4 and 33:7 are on the same subject, but the one is the closing Scripture of section fifteen and the other that which opens section sixteen. Mr. Ward in his thesis on the Minor Prophets in this same project has suggested that a thing more arbitrary than that

^aCf. sections 5, 10, 11, 13, 19, 23, 30.

^bCf. sections 4, 8, 9, 21, 26, 27, 29.

of thought content has controlled Barhebraeus in his divisions. He holds that Barhebraeus allowed the pages or folios of the text which he used to furnish the basis of his sections, a new page constituting a new section regardless of the continuity or break of thought. This theory implies that the Scripture material covered from the opening to the close of each section in Syriac language was approximately the same in size. Some variation in the number of lines on a page might occur, as is evident in Barhebraeus' folios on Isaiah in the Anṣer Rāgē, which range from 34 to 38 lines. This, however, would modify but little the Scripture area between the opening and closing quotations of a division. The point at which the page of his text began or closed is difficult to ascertain. Just how far he read before he found material for comment is uncertain, as is also the distance the last material for remarks was from the bottom of the page. The Scripture between the last used portion of one section and the first used portion of the next could have been little or entirely on the one page or the next.

The following table will show the bearing of the Book of Isaiah on the theory of Mr. Ward. Opposite the section number is indicated the first and the last of the quotations used in that section. These are followed by an indication of the Scripture between the last used quotation of the section under consideration and the first one of the next. The last column states in terms of verses the amount of Scripture within the bounds of the quotations of each section and that outside the same.

Section	Scripture Opening	Scripture Closing	Scripture Intersectional	Scripture Number of Verses	
				Within	Without
1	1:1	2:9	2:10-12	40	3
2	2:13	5:2	5:3-9	44	7
3	5:10	6:13	7:1-3	34	3
4	7:4	8:21	8:22-23	42	2
5	9:1	10:22	10:23	43	1
6	10:24	13:10	---	43	0
7	13:11	14:32	15:1	34	1
8	15:2	17:14	18:1	34	1
9	18:2	20:1	20:2-6	32	5
10	21:1	22:25	---	42	0
11	23:1	25:2	25:3-6	43	4
12	25:7	27:12	27:13	39	1
13	28:1	29:10	29:11-21	39	10
14	29:22	30:26	30:27	29	1
15	30:28	33:4	33:5-6	39	2
16	33:7	35:6		40	
17	Recorded in the Book of Kings				
18	Partly recorded in the Book of Kings				
19	40:1	41:7	---	38	0
20	41:8	42:22	42:23-25-43:1-2	44	5
21	43:3	44:20	44:21	46	1
22	44:22	46:11	46:12-13	43	2
23	47:1	49:1	49:2-6	38	5
24	49:7	51:6	51:7-8	37	2
25	51:9	53:12	54:1-10	42	10
26	54:11	56:12	57:1-5	32	5
27	57:6	59:5	59:6-10	35	5
28	59:11	61:5	61:6-11-62:1	38	7
29	62:2	64:6	64:7-11	36	5
30	65:1	66:17	66:18-24	42	7

The table as arranged above portrays several things:

1. That between three of the sections, six and seven, ten and eleven, and nineteen and twenty, no Scripture intervenes.

2. That there is no break of thought in the Scripture of certain sections and that of the next, the intervening portion being included, as for instance, six and seven and fifteen and sixteen.

3. That the amount of Scripture between the other sections varies from one to ten verses and that within the sections from twenty-nine to forty-six verses.

4. That there is a relationship between the size of the

body of Scripture within the section and that between. The smaller the amount of Scripture within the area of a section, the larger is the total of the portion before and after that section and vice versa.

5. That the Scripture within the various sections takes on a uniformity of size when each section is balanced with that of the intersectional area in accordance with the principle of relationship stated above.

The uniform size of the amount of Scripture connected with each section is somewhat hidden, but not completely obscured. Though it were certain that Barhebraeus allowed his pages to determine his sections, we would still be ignorant of the length of his first page in Isaiah. The text of the same may have started away from the top, as does his first folio of the book in the Florentine manuscript, and the three verses at the end which are outside the quoted area, in part or as a whole, may have closed the first page of his text. However, on the basis of this theory, since no word comes between the quoted portion of 13:10 and that of 13:11, and the one closes the Scripture of one section and the other opens that of the next, the exact point at which the sixth page of his text closed and that of the seventh opened is disclosed. As there is but one verse of unquoted text between sections five and six and only one between seven and eight, the measurement of pages six and seven in his text is portrayed. According to the Urmia text which will average five or six words to the line, should the whole of the unquoted verse following the last used portion in section five be considered a part of the fifth rather than the sixth page of the text of Barhebraeus, and the similar verse following section seven be taken with his eighth page, then his sixth page would contain ninety-

two and his seventh ninety-three lines. If these verses be regarded the one with his sixth and the other with his seventh page, these pages would have ninety-five and ninety-six lines, respectively. A fair division of the two verses with the sections involved would secure ninety-four Urmia lines, or ninety-seven according to the text of Lee, for each of the sixth and seventh pages of his text which we may regard as the uniform size of the page in his text. Using this as a measure and counting in each direction from sections six and seven, we secure for the pages of his text in the Syriac, as those pages were considered in the sections of his Isaiah, the amounts which are stated in the table on the following page according to the number of lines covered in the Urmia and the Lee texts.

There would be twenty lines or so according to either text on the next page which received no comment, making his text a little more than thirty pages.

This data would allow for a uniform page in nearly two-thirds of his text and demand in the remaining portion less variation in the pages of his text than is found in his own scholia on the book.

The Book of Isaiah, therefore, seems to support the theory of Mr. Ward, indicating that the sections into which Barhebraeus divided the book were rather mechanically determined, controlled only by the size of the pages of his text. In the light of this, the varying size of the sections and the division of the same at haphazard points within the chapters are no longer perplexing. More material would interest him for remarks on one page than another and some perchance would require enlarged comments, and the division of the section would come at the point where the page chanced to end.

Section	Scripture Closing Page	Lines in Urmia	Lines in Lee
1	2:10	93	96
2	5:5	94	98
3	7:1	94	98
4	8:23	94	99
5	10:22	95	99
6	13:10	94	97
7	15:1	94	97
8	18:1	91	92
9	20:6	92	91
10	22:25	90	90
11	25:4	94	95
12	27:13	93	94
13	29:11	94	96
14	30:26	94	97
15	33:4	94	97
16	35:6	94	97
17	In Kings		
18	39:2	210 for 17 and 18	214
19	41:7	95	97
20	42:24	98	97
21	44:20	104	108
22	46:11	106	109
23	49:3	94	97
24	51:6	104	109
25	53:12	105	111
26	56:12	103	108
27	59:8	103	108
28	61:8	104	110
29	64:11	104	112
30	66:17	105	114

His Sources

Barhebraeus introduced for consideration thirteen quotations which he referred to as "Greek." Eight of these quotations were from 26:9-14, a portion of the text which, together with the comments thereon, was absent from MS 1, and as the absence applies only to this manuscript we are led to think that such was due, not to any fault of the scribe, but the author's deliberate delay of the troublesome text for further consideration. Of the quotations from the "Greek," nine agree in every particular with the Syro-Hexaplaric version, which is the translation of the LXX column of Origen's Hexapla into Syriac with the critical signs

preserved. The four passages in which the quoted "Greek" differs from the Syro-Hexaplaric version are as follows:

(1) Isaiah 13:12:

Greek:

Greek: $\lambda\alpha\sigma\epsilon\nu$, $\delta\alpha\mu\alpha\zeta\omega$
Syro-Hex.: $\lambda\alpha\sigma\epsilon\nu$, $\delta\alpha\mu\alpha\zomega$

The difference here although apparently large is not so significant. The "Greek" omits prefix σ and the demonstrative pronoun $\alphaὐτοῦ$ and uses the verb $\muένω$ (remain) for $ἐσμέν$ (to be left). Also it has the Paal passive participle of $\muένω$ instead of the Paal and uses the preposition "from" ($\alphaὐτοῦ$) for the adverb and particle "more than" ($\muᾶλλον$) and omits the adjective "refined" ($\καθαρόν$).

(2) Isaiah 17:3:

Greek:

Greek: $\alpha\lambda\phi\alpha$
Syro-Hex.: $\alpha\lambda\phi\alpha$

The differences are quite marked, but not in meaning. The "Greek" coalesces *ub* with the personal pronoun instead of using the participle of *ἰδ* (good) with separate pronoun. He also has the construct of "sons" instead of the absolute followed by *?* and adds a medial *ἰ* in "Israel" and uses "their glory" for "the honor of them."

(3) Isaiah 30:17:

Syriac of BH:

Greek:

Which would be:

Syro-Hex.:

This is a clear misreading of

اس حزا / لا زع مة
سك حزا / فسل
اس فسل / لا زع مة
افسل / لا معة
فسل (snare) for

(fulcrum)

(4) Isaiah 48:1:

Syriac of BH:

Syro-Hex.:

Symm. and Theod.:

1,000, 1,000, 1,000
1,000, 1,000, 1,000
1,000, 1,000, 1,000

This is not a reference to the "Greek" text, but an assertion that a word (1,000) in his text is of Hebrew rather than Greek origin.

The variants of these "Greek" quotations from the Hexaplaric version, while apparently considerable, are not sufficient to demand other sources for their explanation. Carelessness and the custom of quoting from memory would suffice to account for the variations, and the absolute agreement of most of the passages strongly suggests that the text of the Syro-Hexaplaric version was the leading, and most likely the only, source for his "Greek."

A reading from the Nestorians is presented three times and each instance has to do with vocalization. Each of the readings cited from the Nestorian text agrees with the present Urmia text. The quotations are:

(1) Isaiah 24:4:

Text of BH reads: "With e of 2" which would be 2.
Nestorian: "has a of 1" which would be 1.

The text to which this vocalization applies is not in MS 1, but the vocalic citation remains in its margin. The Urmia, the Mosul, and the Abrosian texts have the pointing of the Nestorian, while that of the Lee is not given.

(2) Isaiah 26:9:

Text of BH: "With e of 2 and t and a of w and b" which would be 2.
Nestorian: "Has e of 2 and vowellessness of t and a of second 2" which would be 2.

This Nestorian comment is not in MS 1, as it falls within its extended omission, but MSS 2, 14, and 20 have it. With this Nestorian agree the Urmia and the Mosul, while the Lee and Ambrosian have their vocalization hidden at this point. All other MSS add $\text{A} \text{A} \text{o}$ (and correctly) to the Nestorian citation and to this MS 11 adds the Syriac word with its vowels ($\text{ܐܠܗܐ} / \text{ܐܠܗܐ}$).

(3) Isaiah 59:16:

Text of BH: $\text{ܐܠܗܐ} \text{ܐܠܗܐ}$ ("and his righteousness supported him.")

On this text Barhebraeus remarks "and the eastern people," and this would be the Nestorians, "soften the t's in all feminines." Both the Urmian and the Mosul texts are pointed in accord with this comment, but the Lee and Ambrosian fail to have any of the vowels indicated.

Four times citations are made to "ancient codices," but without data sufficient for us to connect these with the text of any known manuscript or version.

(1) Isaiah 9:14:

"And in (some) codices [$\text{d}^{\text{o}}\text{nuv}^{\text{o}}\text{th}^{\text{a}}$, and in both of them with fricativeness of t]" (See collation).

This agrees with the Ambrosian text, but with no other text of the Peshitto or the manuscripts.

(2) Isaiah 33:14:

"And in some ancient codices 'fall' is written in masculine gender."

This is true of the four known texts of the Peshitto. The Syro-Hexaplaric text is masculine, but it uses ܐܠܗܐ (seize) instead of ܐܠܗܐ (fall).

(3) Isaiah 38:12:

"With e of r and in (some) ancient manuscripts q."

There is no known reading that supports the manuscript to which reference is made. The Urmia and the Mosul text point otherwise, and the Lee and the Ambrosian fail to give the vowels.

(4) Isaiah 51:9:

Barhebraeus says that "killed (/ ) the dragon" in "some ancient manuscripts" read "abolished (/ ) the dragon." There is no known text that supports this reading.

Twice, 53:9 and 64:5, the order of the text is reversed without any citation of source, and void of any basis in the known texts. In the first instance he simply says that the scribe has transposed it.

Of the 567 quotations from the Peshitto there are 403 in exact agreement with all four of its extant texts. There are 87 instances in which all four of the extant Peshitto texts differ from MS l. Most of these are differences of spelling as occasioned by l or l, of prefixing or omitting o or o, of exchanging the prefixes of  and , or of separating a single word into two. Some of the variations are more significant and result in a change of pronomial suffixes, of gender and tense in verbs, of additions and omissions of words, and of changes in particles. The text of Barhebraeus departs 10 times from the text of L. alone, 18 from A alone, 5 from U. alone, and 2 from M. alone. The quoted text varied from L.M.U. 6 times, from A.L.M., 4, from A.M.U., 8, from M.U., 13, from A.M., 2, from L.U., 3, and A.L., 1, and from A.U., 1. The changes in the Ambrosian text are more numerous and of greater significance, while the text of Lee is more nearly like the one used by Barhebraeus, agreeing with it over against the other three in more than a dozen instances.

The Relationship of the Manuscripts

There are ninety-two instances in which a small group of manuscripts read with the text of MS 1 over against some modification of it by the rest of the manuscripts. Of these instances a single manuscript reads with MS 1 and in some way against all others fourteen times. This is done by MS 14 seven times, by MSS 2, 4, and 20 twice each, and by MS 3 once. Of the other instances two manuscripts join in upholding the text of MS 1 against the readings of the others twenty times, three are so united eighteen times, four thus agree nineteen times, five unite in such support thirteen times, and six are combined in this fashion six times. The details of these combinations are significant. Of the two manuscripts grouped with MS 1, eight instances are by MSS 2 and 20, four by 14 and 20, two by 2 and 14, and one each by the combination of 3, 6, and 11 with 14, and 5 and 11 with 20, there being only one instance in which neither 2 nor 14 nor 20 is found. Of the three manuscripts grouped with MS 1, six instances are by MSS 2, 14, and 20, and some two of these appear in all other cases of the group except one, MS 20 being there eighteen times, 2 thirteen times, MS 14 eleven times, MS 5 four times, MSS 3 and 8 twice each, and MSS 6 and 19 once. Of the four manuscripts grouped with MS 1, five instances are by MSS 2, 6, 14, and 20. Manuscript 20 is in the group sixteen times, 2 fifteen times, 14 nine times, 6 eight times, 4 eight times, 3 six times, 5 four times, and MSS 9, 10, and 11 twice each. Of the five and six manuscripts grouped with MS 1, there are three instances in which the combination of MSS 2, 6, 11, 14 and 20 appears. There is only one instance in this entire group from which MS 2 is absent and four in which 20 and five in which 14 do not appear. The presence of MS 6 is evident ten times, 3 nine times, 4 eleven

times, 9 seven times, 10 three times, and 8 and 13 once each.

From this data furnished by group agreement with manuscript 1 it is evident that there is a close relationship between manuscripts 1, 2, 6, 14, and 20. Within this group MSS 2 and 20 have connections more intimate than the others, and are not far from 1, although there are apparent certain studied differences. These two manuscripts are joined eight or ten times in some modification of MS 1, each showing fifteen or sixteen distinctive differences of its own. Connected with these against MS 1 in several instances is MS 14, which at times supports either the one or the other in such changes and is marked by distinctive variations of its own.

The behavior of manuscripts 5, 8-13, 15-17, and 19 is such as to portray common contact. Six times in a body apart from all others they join against the text of MS 1 and qualify it by some omission or addition. In eight other instances this group is joined by MSS 3 and 4 to manifest some change over all others. In dozens of cases this group, less one or two of the number, or plus such from the smaller group, or both minus the one and plus the other, unite in supporting varied changes from those MSS not included. There is a rather prevalent interpenetration of the larger and the smaller groups. This mixing of the two groups is brought about most often by MS 11, both by its presence and by its absence, and quite freely by MSS 3 and 4 in the same fashion. In fact the conduct of MSS 3 and 4 is such as to suggest things of their own in common. These join five times in offering a reading which varies from all others in some addition, omission, or change of spelling. Several times they unite with two or three others, even merging the two main groups, either to support the text or MS 1 or to vary therefrom, each being

characterized by numerous and marked differences of its own.

Whatever may have been the influence of MS 1 on the groups of families and the specific members thereof, it cannot be considered Barhebraeus' original manuscript of the commentary. Its disclosure of certain omissions, its use of words unsuited to the content of the passage in which they occur, and its retention of disturbed words bespeak its dependence and remove it from the position of first cause. The most extended omission of MS 1 is found in 35:1 of folio 150 b. This is several lines in length and has considerable text material. It makes large use of the readings of the Greek. Doubtless its omission was in part for further study, but this cannot account for its whole behavior. Following section twenty-six, folio 153 b, line 36, the beginning of section twenty-eight is given and followed for a few lines. A shift is then made to section twenty-seven in its entirety, which is followed by the whole of section twenty-eight. Such deportment is not foreign to the copyist and cannot be explained apart from the effort of the maker of MS 1 to reproduce a given manuscript. The first word of folio 152 a, line 24, is ~~ἰσ~~ (possessions) in MS 1 and fails to convey meaning. The other manuscripts read ~~ἰσ~~ (read) which is well suited to the content. Such modification could naturally arise, if the producer of MS 1 were copying, but such would be a strange mishap for one creating material. The necessity for the same explanation characterizes the occurrence of ~~ἰσ~~ (idols) in 26:8 of folio 150 a, which is averse to the comment of Barhebraeus, whereas the older manuscripts read ~~ἰσ~~ (tables) which fit in with the remarks of the commentator. That MS 1 is less exact and minute in its considerations than MS 2 and that the latter portrays the results of further study on some passages than was used

by the former strongly suggest that MS 1 was produced during the lifetime of Barhebraeus, and was being improved by him, and that MS 2 came into being after his death, receiving the care and reverence due the worthy one whose commentary was now closed.

